



PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Serge Jean Maurice Mister  
Serial No.: 09/343,958  
Filing Date: June 30, 1999  
Confirmation No.: 8512

Examiner: Kambiz Zand  
Art Group: 2132  
Docket No.: 0500.9904131  
Our File No.: 10500.99.4131

**Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR PREVENTING INTERCEPTION OF  
INPUT DATA TO A SOFTWARE APPLICATION**

---

Mail Stop RCE  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

*Certificate of First Class Mailing*  
*I hereby certify that this paper is being deposited with the*  
*United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an*  
*envelope addressed to: Mail Stop RCE, Commissioner for*  
*Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on*  
*this date.*

3/23/05  
Date

Christine A. Wright  
Christine A. Wright

**PRELIMINARY RESPONSE**

Dear Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action mailed March 7, 2005, Applicant files an RCE and submits the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Applicant again wishes to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 10-15 and 24-29 are allowed and that claims 6, 9, 21, 23, 35 and 37 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9, 16-20, 22, 30-34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fadem et al. in view of Young et al. In the Advisory Action, the Examiner notes that he would reconsider his position if the Applicant's arguments are persuasive in a manner to demonstrate that the link flow control (LFC) and key stroke data are actual data and not insertion data in the Fadem reference. The Advisory Action also